



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/189,043	11/09/1998	SCOTT M. ROCKLAGE	238/117	5059

21834 7590 12/03/2001

BECK AND TYSVER  
2900 THOMAS AVENUE SOUTH  
SUITE 100  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55419

EXAMINER

HARTLEY, MICHAEL G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1619

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2001

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Offic Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/189,043	ROCKLAGE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael G. Hartley	1619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4,8 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4,8,21 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
  - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

***Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I in Paper No. 10 is acknowledged.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4, 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the recitations of "modified blood flow" and "or modification therein" are confusing.

The claim is drawn to a method of detecting blood flow abnormality or variation; however, an abnormality or variation is not the same as a modification. For example, an abnormality or variation would not require an active modifying step, as would a modification. Thus, it is unclear how the identification step of modified blood flow or a modification, as claims, relates to the claimed method of detecting blood flow abnormality or variation. The dependent claims fall therewith.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "such a chelate" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The claim does not previously recite a chelate, therefore, such a chelate lacks antecedent basis. This rejection can be obviated by inserting the word "chelate" after the word tolerable in line 2 of claim 2.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 8 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either one of Belliveau (SMRM 8, 8/1988) or Cacheris (SMRM 8, 8/1988) in view of Rosen in further view of Villringer.

Art Unit: 1619

Belliveau discloses methods of MRI comprising administering Dy-DPTA to a subject and measuring the perfusion of various brain areas, see column 2. High-speed imaging is used to ascertain changes between MRI signal intensity in gray and white matter of the brain. These changes would be within the scope of "variations" as claimed. Cacheris teach methods of intravascular contrast-enhanced susceptibility MRI to the brain to measure changes in signal intensity over time of brain perfusion. Cacheris discloses the use of Cy-DTPA-BMA, which is the same contrast as claimed. These changes would be within the scope of "variations" as instantly claimed.

Belliveau and Cacheris fail to specifically disclose that the perfusion rates are quantitatively related to blood flow.

Rosen teaches analytic techniques wherein MRI contrast agents are used to produce quantitative values for perfusion.

Villringer discloses the use of contrast agents to measure perfusion changes and teaches that perfusion is directly related to blood flow, see abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to quantitatively measure blood flow in the perfusion imaging methods disclosed by Belliveau and/or Cacheris because Rosen teaches MRI techniques can be used to quantitative analyze perfusion, which provide the advantage of quantitative results and to use such methods for determining blood flow because it is known in the art that perfusion rates are directly related to blood flow which provides physiological data on blood flow, as shown by Villringer.

#### ***Double Patenting***

A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

Art Unit: 1619

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,833,947. This is a double patenting rejection. The pending claim and patented claim are the same.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-4, 8 and 21 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,190,744. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims are drawn to the same methods. The instantly claimed methods encompass those of the patented claims, which limit the detection to ischemic regions, which is within the scope of abnormality as claimed.

#### ***Specification***

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

#### ***Drawings***

The drawings filed 11/08/1998 have been approved by the draftsman.

#### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed at this time.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael G. Hartley whose telephone number is (703) 308-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-5, off alternative Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diana Dudash can be reached on (703) 308-2328. The fax phone numbers for the organization where

Art Unit: 1619

this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.



Michael G. Hartley  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1619

November 30, 2001